

REMARKS

By this amendment, (i) claims 54-59, 61-66, 69-75, 78-83, 87-908 are pending, (ii) claims 76, 77, 84, 85 and 86 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, (iii) claims 54-59, 61-66, 69-75, 78-83 are currently amended, and (iv) claims 87-90 are newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Final Office Action mailed May 25, 2010: (1) rejected claims 54, 61-66, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani *et al.* (US 6,314,108) in view of Guilford *et al.* (US 7,433,929); (2) rejected claims 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of Guilford, and further in view of Wang *et al.* (US 2002/0198946); (3) rejected claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of Guilford, and further in view of Tamura *et al.* (US 2002/0023092); (4) rejected claims 69, 73 and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of Guilford, and further in view of Mousseau *et al.* (US 2002/0120696); and (5) rejected claims 70 and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of Guilford, and further in view of Agnihotri *et al.* (US 2003/0101150).

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 54 and 72. As amended, each of independent claims 54 and 72 recite the aspect of “maintaining a log of session activities that have occurred with respect to the terminal.” Prior to this amendment, dependent claim 55 introduced the aspect of maintaining a log, however, the log recited in claim 55 consisted of “a log of the sourced user content.” The rejection of claim 55 first acknowledges that the combination of Ramasubramani in view of Guilford fails to disclose the maintenance of a log of the sourced user content. The rejection then relies on Wang for the disclosure and of

this aspect of claim 55. Specifically the rejection cites to Wang at Paragraphs 81-85 for the teaching of “a content delivery system where a log is maintained in relation to sourced user content.” *See Paragraph No. 22 of the present Office Action (Page 7).*

Wang generally teaches a content delivery system for the delivery of alerts regarding content to which a user has subscribed. The system of Wang categorizes the alerts in different categories, and each category is assigned a delivery mode. The delivery mode specifies a hierarchy of various delivery methods, whereby the system attempts to first deliver the alert by the primary method defined by the delivery mode (i.e., instant messaging). If the primary method fails, the system will attempt delivery via a secondary method defined by the delivery mode (i.e., email). The process continues until the delivery is successful or all defined delivery methods of the delivery mode are exhausted.

The cited paragraphs 81-85 of Wang disclose a process whereby the content delivery system provides for an acknowledgement field to indicate that an acknowledgement is expected, and a time-out period for the acknowledgement. If the acknowledgement is not received within the time-out period, then the delivery will be deemed to have failed. Considering this disclosure in view of the rejection of claim 55, while the indication that an acknowledgement is expected may be considered as a log “in relation to the sourced user content” (as stated in the rejection), this acknowledgement process of Wang fails to teach or suggest maintenance of a log where the log comprises “a log of the sourced user content” (as recited in claim 55). Moreover, as presented above, amended claims 54 and 72 recite the maintenance of a log of session activities that have occurred with respect to the terminal. Based on the reasoning presented above, Wang also fails to disclose or suggest the maintenance of a log of session activities that have occurred with respect to the terminal, as recited in independent claims 54 and 72.

Accordingly, the paragraphs of Wang cited by the rejection of claim 55 under § 103 fail to disclose or suggest the maintenance of a log of the session activities with respect to the terminal, as recited in each of the independent claims 54 and 72 of the present application. Further, Applicant submits that Wang as a whole fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, neither of the applied references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the claim feature of maintaining a log of session activities that have occurred with respect to the terminal, and the combination of Ramasubramani in view of Guilford and further in view of Wang thus fail to render the independent claims 54 and 72 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The rejection of dependent claims 55-59, 61-66, 69-71, 73-75 and 78-83 should be withdrawn, and new claims 87-90 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

August 25, 2010
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41254

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax (703) 519-9958